

REMARKS:

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-11, 13, and 14 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-11, 13 and 14 have been amended, and claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 12 remains cancelled. No new matter has been presented.

Thus, claims 1, 3-11, 13 and 14 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT:

A copy of Form PTO-1449 submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) of July 20, 2006 is enclosed herein. It appears the Examiner did not consider references AG on Form PTO-1449 filed with the IDS on July 20, 2006.

The Applicants respectfully submit that, as shown on Forms PTO-1449 of the IDS filed on July 20, 2006, reference AG corresponds generally in disclosure to Reference AA (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,478). Further, English Abstract of the non-English reference AG (JP2000-32033) was submitted. MPEP §609.04(a)(III) states, "Submission of an English language abstract of a reference may fulfill the requirement for a concise explanation." Also, §1.98(a) does not require "a full translation of relevant material", but rather a "concise explanation of the relevance."

See also the Office Action dated March 1, 2007 which indicates the reference AG as having been considered.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider reference AG (JP2000-32033) by initialing the enclosed PTO-1449 of the IDS filed July 20, 2006.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112:

In item 8 on page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-11 have been amended and no longer include the language in the form rejected by the Examiner.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102:

In item 14 on page 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,478 (Sugano). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites "a watcher list for each of clients in the clients group", "accepting a change of an identifier of the first client", "deciding at least one of watcher clients of the first client to be one or more identifier notification recipients" and "replacing an old identifier of the first client with a new identifier, and replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with at least one identifier of the decided identifier notification recipients." The Applicants respectfully submit that Sugano does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1. See also claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 reciting similar features.

Instead, Sugano is directed to information management where a change in user information prompts notification in accordance with access levels of the notification recipient and frequency control (see, Fig. 2).

At least on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner stated that the Specification at page 23, lines 5-12 nor the claims indicate a feature(s) directed to "re-register a watcher associated with a user when the user changes his or her use[r] ID." By this Amendment, the independent claims recite "replacing an old identifier of the first client with a new identifier, and replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with at least one identifier of the decided identifier notification recipients" which is not taught or suggested by Sugano.

Support for the claim amendments can be found at least in Fig. 3 and 10 including corresponding text of the Specification as filed. For example, Fig. 10 illustrates determination of whether there is a change associated with an account, determine notification recipient list and update watcher list.

Sugano does not disclose or suggest at least the feature "a watcher list for each of clients" and re-registering that occurs when a change of an identifier of the first client occurs by "replacing an old identifier of the first client with a new identifier, and replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with at least one identifier of the decided identifier notification recipients", as taught by the claimed invention. See each of independent claims 1, 10, 11, 13 and 14.

Accordingly, Sugano does not disclose each and every element of the Applicants' independent claims. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach

each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Sugano does not disclose the features recited in the independent claims, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims patentably distinguish over Sugano, and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims depending from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by Sugano.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Sugano. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 5 recites, "storing a distribution history of distributed text messages" and "extracting at least one of a plurality of watcher clients of the first client based on the distribution history, and deciding to be one or more identifier notification recipients." Sugano does not teach or suggest these features of claim 5. Instead, Sugano is directed to having a user add a message to be inserted in user information object (UIO) to be sent to a specific user (see, col. 39, lines 39-48).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/05/2009

By: Ternit Afework
Ternit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501